

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action dated March 25, 2005 and the references cited therein. In response thereto, claims 1, 3, 5-8, 13-15 are amended, and claims 1-17 are pending in the present application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-17 are now amended to clarify the statutory subject matter.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Weismen et al. (US 2003/0014329).

Claim 1 recites a method in a computerized system for building a quote for a piece of equipment comprising displaying on a client side one or more pre-engineered specifications for the equipment to be quoted; electronically soliciting from a user a selection of one pre-engineered specification; soliciting from the user a selection of a manufacturer of a first component of the pre-engineered specification; displaying options and quoted prices for the user at the client side for the first component and allowing the user to select one or more options for the same, the act of displaying options and quoted prices including updating the displayed options and quoted prices after an interrelated option has been selected; and generating a report at the client side showing the options selected for the first component and a quoted subtotal cost for the component.

Weisman describes a method for cataloguing, displaying, and retrieving information and for ordering and acquiring spare parts and accessories for vehicles. Nowhere in Weisman does it

disclose or teach a method for building a quote for a piece of equipment as recited in claim 1, nor does Weisman disclose or teach a method of building a quote for an equipment that gives a user the flexibility of select one or more options with quoted prices displayed, and also displays user's updates of options and quoted prices after an interrelated option has been selected. Also, Weisman fails to disclose or teach generating a report at the client side showing the options selected for a component and a quoted subtotal cost for the component. The objective of Weisman is to electronically catalogue, display and retrieve information (page 2, paragraph [028]), not to build a quote via a user's interactive selection of options with the corresponding quoted price displayed. Further, in Figures 13 I-IV, Weisman shows a full order of the options selected for a component and the subtotal cost for the component. However, such full order is not a report generated to show a user his/her options for building a quote for a piece of equipment before placing a full order. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Weisman.

Claims 2-7 which are dependent from claim 1 are also patentable over Weisman for at least the reasons stated above.

Independent claims 8 and 15 also recite at least some of the features discussed above in which Weisman fails to disclose or teach. The remaining claims are dependent claims of either claim 8 or claim 15. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8-17 are patentable over Weisman.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application now stands in allowable form. Reconsideration of the present application and a favorable response are respectfully requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues, please
contact the undersigned at 612-752-7367.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Customer Number 25763

Date:

April 27, 2005

By:

Min S. Xu

Min (Amy) S. Xu, Reg. No. 39,536
(612) 752-7367